| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--|---|
| | 09/700,443 | HOENIG ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Kishor Mayekar | 1753 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | |
| (1) <u>Kishor Mayekar</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Hilmar Fricke</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 17 May 2004 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | eant's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Nejection(s) discussed. | | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| 22 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: KLEIN '750 | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE | RAL NATURE OF WHAT WA | S DISCUSSED: |
| The Attorney has agreed to cancel product-by-process claim 21 claim 22 in the response of March 1, 2004. | by an examiner's amendemnt be | ecause there is no argument to |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand | e examiner will provide a writ record of the substance of the | ten summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | · |
| | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant | t/Applicant's Representative S | ignature – if appropriate) |